

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF AUGUST 14, 2006

2006-0524 – Application for a Design Review on an 11,180 square foot site to allow a new two-story home for a total of 4,320 square feet where 4,050 square feet may be allowed without Planning Commission review. The property is located at **272 North Murphy Avenue** (near Central Expressway) in an R-0 (Low-Density Residential) Zoning District. (APN: 204-44-033) RK (**Continued from July 24, 2006**)

Ryan Kuchenig, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. He said staff is recommending Condition of Approval (COA) 3.B.1 to simplify the second-story rooflines, which should improve the look of the house from the street and reduce the overall scale of the home. He said staff also recommends reductions to the overall window size of the first and second-story facades. He said the home is larger than the majority of the homes in the neighborhood, but staff finds that the home will not have a significant impact on the neighborhood due to the characteristics of the property. He said staff has recommended COAs that improve the visual mass and scale of the home and recommends approval of the Design Review subject to the COAs.

Comm. Simons referred to the roof modification requested in COA 3.B.1 and asked how much square footage increase to the floor area of the home might be expected. Mr. Kuchenig said the modification to the roof would probably result in less than a 100 square foot increase in the floor area. **Trudi Ryan**, Planning Officer, referred to Attachment E and said that the increase could be less than 40 square feet.

Comm. Babcock asked if an accessory unit could be allowed in the future on this property if the home were built out to the proposed Floor Area Ratio (FAR). Mr. Kuchenig said an accessory unit could be applied for, but it would have to be heard by the Planning Commission due to the home being over 4,050 square feet. Ms. Ryan clarified that the Planning Commission would be required to hear the item if the accessory living unit being applied for was new square footage, however not if it was within the existing structure. Comm. Babcock asked if the Planning Commission could at this time disallow the building of future accessory units on this property. Ms. Ryan said no that the Planning Commission does not have that option.

Comm. Rowe asked if the roofline changes would affect the setbacks of the roofline. Mr. Kuchenig said the roofline setbacks would still meet the minimum standard and the eave may be positioned closer, but it should not encroach on the front yard setback.

Chair Klein opened the public hearing.

David Langtry, the applicant, thanked staff and the Commission for their assistance. He said he agrees with most of the changes, but that he likes the roofline the way it is proposed as it is more interesting, complicated and has more character. He said he has no problem with adding the pillars on the front of the house by the single-car garage, but requested to eliminate the one pillar furthest to the left as he would like the entry way to be the focal point rather than the office window. He concluded that he is satisfied with the recommended changes, but would like to keep the proposed heavier eave and the roofline in front.

Chair Klein closed the public hearing.

Comm. Rowe referred to Attachment E and asked staff for clarification about the dotted lines on the drawing of the front view of the home. Ms. Ryan said the dotted line connected to the roofline indicates what the applicant proposed and referred to Attachment C, page 3 to show what the roofline might look like. Ms. Ryan said the suggestion is to change the roofline so the garage area looks like it has an independent roof and is not connected to the second floor.

Chair Klein asked staff about the pillars. Ms. Ryan said that staff is only suggesting modification to the eave and the roofline and is not suggesting any other modifications. She said if the applicant wants to incorporate the pillar features that that would be acceptable, but staff's focus is to modify the roof.

Comm. Babcock moved for Alternative 2, to approve the Design Review with modified conditions, eliminating COA 3.B.1 requiring a roof variation along the second-story. Comm. Hungerford seconded.

Comm. Babcock said this is a large lot that can support a large house. She said she agrees that the proposed design is more unique, custom and richer looking than the staff request to make the design more ordinary.

Comm. Simons asked staff about the pillar comment made by the applicant and confirmed that the pillars were a recommendation and not a requirement. He confirmed with Comm. Babcock that her motion is to allow the heavier eave design.

Comm. Hungerford said he agrees that the roofline is more interesting as proposed rather than the more simplified straight-line approach. He said the Design Review Guidelines encourage avoiding overly complex floor plans with visually busy walls and roof forms. He said he guessed this is the criteria that we are judging this. He said it is a subjective position, and that the proposed design is not overly busy and that it is more interesting.

Comm. Rowe said she would not be supporting the motion. She said she agrees with the Planning Division that the house does look massive. She said cutting back on some of the massive look of the house would be a nice compromise.

ACTION: Comm. Babcock made a motion on 2006-0524 to approve the Design Review with modified conditions, eliminating Condition of Approval 3.B.1 requiring a roof variation along the second-story. Comm. Hungerford seconded. Motion carried, 5-2, Vice Chair Sulser and Comm. Rowe dissenting.

APPEAL OPTIONS: This item is final unless appealed to the City Council no later than August 29, 2006.